

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No.	CV 25-00104-AS	Date	April 10, 2025
----------	----------------	------	----------------

Title	Jane Doe v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
-------	---

Present: The Honorable	Alka Sagar, United States Magistrate Judge
------------------------	--

Alma Felix	N/A
------------	-----

Deputy Clerk	Court Smart / Recorder
--------------	------------------------

Attorneys Present for Plaintiff:	Attorneys Present for Defendants:
----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

N/A	N/A
-----	-----

Proceedings: (IN CHAMBERS) ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE RE SERVICE OF PROCESS ON DEFENDANT LOS ANGELES COUNTY SHERIFF’S DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEE “DOE” PONTON

On January 6, 2025, Jane Doe (“Plaintiff”) filed a complaint against Los Angeles County, Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department (collectively, “County Defendants”), Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department Employee “Doe” Ponton (“Doe Ponton”), and Does 2–100. (Dkt. No. 1). On January 8, 2025, the Clerk issued a summons as to the County Defendants and Doe Ponton. (Dkt. No. 6). Plaintiff thereafter submitted proofs of service establishing that she served the County Defendants on January 13, 2025. (Dkt. Nos. 7, 8).

More than ninety days have passed since Plaintiff filed the complaint and the Clerk issued the summons. Yet Plaintiff has not filed a proof of service reflecting that she served Defendant Doe Ponton. Rule 4(m) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides that if service of the summons and complaint is not made upon a defendant within ninety days of filing the complaint, “the court—on motion or on its own after notice to the plaintiff—must dismiss the action without prejudice against that defendant or order that service be made within a specified time.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m). If the plaintiff, however, “shows good cause for the failure, the court must extend the time for service for an appropriate period.” Id.

Plaintiff is therefore ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE in writing, within fourteen days of the date of this Order, why service was not timely made on Doe Ponton, and why this case should not be dismissed against Doe Ponton without prejudice for failure to effectuate service and for lack of prosecution. Failure to timely file a written response to this Order may result in dismissal of this action against Doe Ponton for failure to effect service of process within the time specified

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No. CV 25-00104-AS

Date April 10, 2025

Title Jane Doe v. County of Los Angeles, et al.

by Rule 4(m) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, for failure to prosecute, and/or for failure to obey a court order. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

IT IS SO ORDERED.